new species among this family, and I do not believe that over fom* dif. ferent kinds are to be found in this upper country.

## j. Salvelinus malma.

Bull Tront, Coenr d'Alene Lake, Angnst 5. Belly silver white; back and upper parts grayish, spotted with round pink markings; head darker than the back, which seems to be bluish black.

##   by CHAREES L. MCHAY.

The object of this paper is to give a catalogne of the genera and species of Centrarchidle recoguized by me, in anticipation of a monographic review of the family which I hope to publish at some future time. The results here obtained are based on a study of all the specimens of Centrarchide in the United States National Musemm and in the collection of Professor Jordan. Types of nearly all the nominal species thus far described have been examined and compared, and I believe that very few of those here mentioned will prove invalid. The species not examined by me are designated by a star (*).

## 1. Genus Centrarches C. \& V.

1. Centrarchus macropterus (Lac.) Jor. $=C$. iridens C. © V.

The characters assumed to distiugush C. mocropterus and C. irideus disappear on examination of a large series.
2. Genus Pomoxys Rafinesque.
2. Pomoxys sparoides (Lac.) Girard. $=$ Centrarchus hexucanthus Cuv. \& Val.
3. Pomoxys annularis Raf.
3. Gehus Archoplites Gill.
4. Archoplites interruptus (Grd.) Gill.
4. Genus Ambloplites Rafinesque.
5. Ambloplites rupestris (Raf.) Gill. = ? A. carifrons Cope.
5. Genus Acantmarchus Gill.
6. Acantharchus pomctis (Baird) Gill.

[^0]
## 6. Gemis Chenomrytud Gill.

7. Chænobryttus gulosus (C.\& V.) Jor. = Centrarchus vividis C. \& V.; Choenobryttus rivilis Jor. ; Lepomis gilli Cope; Calliurus floridensis Holbr.
8. Chænobryttus antistius McKay, nom. sp. nov. = Clossoplites melanops Jor. Man. Vert. ed. i, p. 317, and Chwobryttus gulosus Jor., Ann. Lyc. Nat. Hist. 1876.
This species is best distinguished from the preceding by the position of the dorsal, the first spine being situated over the posterior margin of the operenlar lobe, while in C.gulosus the first spine is situated directly over the posterior portion of the base of the pectorals. The only specimens of this species known to me are in the collection of Professor Jordan. The types are from Lake Michigan. There are smaller specimens in the collection from the Upper Wabash and the Illinois Rivers. I have examined specimens of $C$. gulosus, which is a southern form, in the National Museum, from each of the Southern States, from Texas to Vir. ginia.

## 7. Genis Leponis Rafinesque.

This genus, as understood by me, includes Apomotis, Xenotis, Bryttus, Helioperen, Tystroplites, and Eupomotis of authors. Apomotis has been separated from Lepomis on account of the large size of the supplemental maxillary. On careful comparison this is found to be scarcely larger than in one or two other species of Lepomis. It disappears by degrees, but seems to exist in all the species, thongh sometimes so small as to be inappreciable. I have even found it present in large specimens of $L$. pallidus. Its presence in the species is only a character of degree, therefore not generic. Till the gromp had been more fully studied, Xenotis was supposed to contain a large number of species, and was separated from Lepomis principally for convenience' sake, and on the slight character of the feeble gill-rakers. By the comparison of a very large series of the alleged species from Professor Jordan's collection I have come to the conclusion that they are all forms of a single species. The gillrakers are usually rather more feeble than in the rest of the species of Lepomis, but this again is a question of degree. Bryttus has been distinguished from Lepomis by the presence of palatine teeth. This is also a character of degree, and is subject to the most perfect gradation. I have found it impossible to retain Xystroplites and Eupomotis also, as there is complete gradation in the character of the pharyngeals between Lepomis proper and Xystroplites, and again between Tystroplites and Eupomotis both as to the width and form of the bones themselves and the form of the teeth.
9. Lepomis cyanellus Raf.
10. Lepomis symmetricus * Forbes, MSS. (in Jordan \& Gillert's Synopsis Fishes N. A. ineel.).
11. Lepomis phenax (Cope \& Jor.) McKay.
12. Lepomis murinus (Grd.) McKay.

Some of the types of Calliurus murinus Grd. belong to L. cyanellus, but the specimen figured by him in the U. S. P. R. R. Exp., x, pl. vii, Fig.

1, belongs to a different species, apparently distinct from all others known. Type B. \& G. No. 415, U. S. Nat. Mus.
13. Lepomis lirus * McKay, nom. sp. nov. = Pomotis pallidus Ag. Not Labras pallidus Mitch. Not Eupomotis pallidus Jor, which is Lepomus notatus. According to Professor Bliss (in letter to Professor Jordan), the pharyngeal teeth of this species are pared.
14. Lepomis ischyrus Jordan \& Nelson.
15. Lepomis macrochirus Raf.
16. Lepomis punctatus (C. \& V.) Jor. = L. apiatus Cope.
17. Lepomis miniatus Jordan.
18. Lepomis humilis (Grel.) Cop $\mathrm{e} .=$ L. anagallinus Cope. Type No. 480, U. S. Nat. Mus. From Brazos R., Tex.
19. Lepomis auritus (L.) Raf.
19. a Lepomis auritus var. solis (C. \&. V.) McKay = Lepomis rubricaula Holbr.

The variety is the southern form, and is distinguished from the northern by having larger scales on the cheeks (usually 7 rows instead of 8 ) and in front of the pectorals, and usually a dark blotch on posterior margin of dorsal.
20. Lepomis megalotis (Raf.) Cope. = Pomotis inscriptus Ag.; Lepomis peltustes Cope. : Tenotis aureolns Jor. ; Yenotis solis Gill \& Jor. ; Xenotis lythrochloris Jor. ; Ichthelis auritus Raf.; Pomotis sanguinolentus Ag.; Pomotis nitilus Kirtland ; Pomotis popeii Grd. ; Pomotis fullax B. \& G. ; I'omotis brexiceps B. \& G.
21. Lepomis marginatus* (Ifolbr.) McKay.
22. Lepomis elongatus * (Hollr.) Gill \& Jor.
23. Lepomis pallidus (Mitch.) Gill $\mathbb{E}$ Jor. = Lepomis obscurns (Ag.) Jur.
24. Lepomis bombifrons * (Ag.) Jor.
25. Lepomis heros (B. \& G.) McKay = Fystroplites heros, Jor.
26. Lepomis albulus (Grel.) McKar.

The types of this species have been recently found and are identical with Tystroplites gilli Jor. Type No. 421, U. S. Nat. Mus. Rio Blanco, Tex.
27. Lepomis euryorus McKay. Sp. nor.

Body very robust, compressed. Form nearly oral; dorsal outline more convex than rentral. Antedorsal outline rather steep, slightly conrex. Profile slightly depressed abore eye. Mouth quite oblique, rather small; maxillary reaching to front margin of eje. Onter row of teeth on both jaws much stronger than the others. Teeth on vomer and front portion of palatines. Lower pharyngeals with the rather long posterior spur turned up; stoutish, the inner angle rounded, somewhat obtuse. Teeth stout, rery much blunted, not close set; the inner considerably stronger and less blunt than the rest. The characters of the pharyngeals are those ascribed by Professor Jordan to the genus Xystroplites. Gill-rakers short, stout, nearly terete, about eight in number,
the inner surface ronghened, scarcely dentate. Branchiostegals six. Maxillary with a small but perfectly distinct supplemental bone. Eye very small, considerably less than length of suout (perhaps an iudividual character). Nostrils in line with pupil. Preorbital quadrate, mostly below line of pupil; preoperculum moderately large, lower angle rounded, very slightly obtuse. Scales on cheeks moderate, in six to seven rows. Opercle rather large, triangular, with the posterior angle produced into a rounded bony flap, nearly equaling the suout in length. The flap is of a shiny black color as in L. cyanellus, surronnded by a rery broad membranons margin, which is white in the alcoholic specimen. Scales on the opercle large, in five rorrs. Suboperculum of nearly the same width throughont, with a single row of scales. Interoperculum wider than suboperculum, with abouta row aud a half of scales. Scales continued upwards a short distance between opercle and preopercle. Spine of the premaxillary stout and broad; width at base equal to one-third of interorbital space, moderately long, reaching to posterior nostril. Mucous chamel from eye to suprascapular bone extremely narrow, scarcely separating the scales. Scales moderately large, etenoid. Dorsal beginuing over base of pectorals. Dorsal and anal somewhat obliquely opposed. Spinous portion of dorsal fin low, the longest spine reaching very little past margin of eye. Spines not rery stout, nearly straight; all but the first two of nearly the same height. Soft portion of dorsal much higher than spinous, reaching greatest height at seventl and eighth rays, behind which it descends abruptly. Both candal pedmele and fin short and stont. Soft portion of anal rounded. Insertion of rentrals behind base of pectorals, not reaching beyond rent. Pectorals short, only reaching vent. Scales in front of pectorals not much reduced, considerably larger than those on cheeks. The description of the species is taken from a single specimen, No. 4109, in the Uniterl States National Musemm, from Fort Gratiot, Michigan, at the foot of Lake Hurou.

> Table of Measurements.

Slecies: Lepomis curyorus.

| Current number of specimen <br> Locality $\qquad$ | $4109 .$ <br> Fort Gratiut, Michigan. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dimensions. | Inches and lo0ths. | 100the of length. |
| Extreme length | ${ }_{6}^{64}{ }^{64}$ |  |
| Eorly : |  |  |
| Greatest height. <br> Greatest wilth |  | 43 |
| Least height of tail |  |  |
| Length of caudal peduncle |  | $13 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Head: |  |  |
| Distance from snout to nape .... |  | ${ }_{13}^{273}$ |
| Greatest width .............. |  | 16 |
| Wiath of interorbital area. |  | $10 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Lensth of snont... |  | 9 |
| Length of ear-tlap . |  | ${ }_{13}^{8}$ |

Table of measurements-Continued.

| Dimensions. | Inches and 100ths. | 100ths of length. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Head: |  |  |
| Length of mandille |  | $12{ }^{\frac{3}{4}}$ |
| Dorsal (spmous) : |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Length of base ..... |  | $\because 6$ |
| (rreatest height at fifth spine |  | $9{ }^{\frac{1}{3}}$ |
| Height at tirst spine . |  | 3 㐌 |
| Dorsal (sott) : |  |  |
| Length of base <br> lleight at antecerlent spine |  | ${ }^{17}{ }^{2}$ |
| Height at lougest ray (the serenth) |  | $17^{8}$ |
| Anal: |  |  |
| Distance from snout |  | 57 |
| Length of base . |  | 20 |
| Ileight at first spine. |  | 4乭 |
| Height at thixd spine |  | $10^{2}$ |
| Height at longest ras (the fitth) |  | $14 \frac{1}{2}$ |
| Candal: |  |  |
| Pectoral: |  |  |
| Distance from snout |  | 31 |
| Length. |  | 201 |
| Teatral: |  |  |
| Distance from snout. |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Anal ............................................................................ 11110 . 10 ....... |  |  |
| Number of transserse rows above lateral line Number of trausterse rows below lateral line |  | 6 |
|  | 14-15 |  |

26. Lepomis gibbosus (L.) Mcinay.

In the little-known eleventlo or Halle edition of the Syistema Niaturae of Linnetus, occur the following descriptions:
"Labrus auritus. L. cauda bifida, opereu-
lis branchiarum pinnifor-
nuibus. D. $\frac{1}{2} \frac{0}{1}$. P. 15. V.6. A. 13. C. 17.
Habitat in Philadelphia. Mas. De Geer." (1. 283.)
"Perea gibbosa. P. pinnis dorsalibus uni-
tis, cauda bifida, abdo-
mine luteo, operculio
striatis, apice nigro ful-
roque.
Catesb. car. 2. 1). S. t. S.
f. 3. Perca fluviatilis gib-
bosa, rentre luteo.
Habitat in America." (p. 293.)
The description of Perca gibbosa refers of course to Eupomotis auren? of authors, and the specific name of gibbosus must supersede aureus Walbanm 1792. In his twelfth edition Linnacus suppressed his Perce gibbosa, and referred Catesby's figure of Perca fluviatilis gibbosa with doubt, to the Labrus auritus. The description in the twelfth edition, as Professor Gill has shown, can refer only to $L$. auritus. The specific
name, giblosus, therefore, should be applied to Eupomotis aurens of authors, and curitus to the northern form of the other species.
29. Lepomis holbrooki (C. \& V.) McKay $=$ Pomotis speciosus Holbr.

Э0. Lepomis notatus (Ag.) McKay = Eupomotis pallidus Gill \& Jordan.
Professor Jordan has received from the Musem of Comparative Zoölogy some of Agassiz's types of Pomotis notatus, which species prores on examination to be identical with Eupomotis pallidus, Gill \& Jordan..

## 8. Genus Mesogonistius Gill.

31. Mesogonistius chætodon (Bairl) Gill.

## 9. Genus Enneacantmus Gill.

This genus, as understood by me, includes Hemioplites and Copelandia. The genus Hemioplites was based by Cope on the presence of eight spines in the dorsal fin and four in the anal. I learn from Professor Jordan's notes that Cope's original type of Hemioplites simulans has really nine spines in the dorsal. Dr. Edward $J$. Nolan, who has recently examined the specimen, also informs me that there are nine spines in the dorsal. In a collection of young specimens of Enneacanthus margarotis from Virginia, which I have examined in the National Museum, there were several specimens with the fin formula D. 9, A. 4, several with the formula D. 10, A. 4 , and the remainder with the formula D. 9 , A. 3. That is, some of these specimens, all collected at the same time, and evidently of the same species, were Emneacanthus margarotis, others were Hemioplites simulans, and the remainder would represent a second species of Copelandia.

In 120 specimens of Enneacanthus margarotis examined by me, the results were as follows:

13 specimens with D. S, A. З.
S9 specimens with D. $9, \Lambda .3$.
9 specimens with D. 10, A. 3.
5 specimens with D. 10, A. 4.
4 specimens with D. 9, A. 4.
In the examination of 53 specimens of Enneacanthats obests the follow. ing results were obtained:

4 specimens with D. S, A. 3.
46 specimens with D. 9, A. 3.
a specimens with D. 10, A. 3 .
1 specimen with D. 10, A. 4.
In view of these facts, I inelude Hemioplitcs and Copclandia under Enncacanthus.
32. Enneacanthus simulans (Cope) McKay $=$ Enneacanthus margarotis Gill \& Jor.; Hemioplites simulans Cope; Enncacantlus pimniger Gill \& Jor.
Having examined the types of Enneacanthus pimiger, and compared them with large-finnel males of Enneacanthus margarotis, I am unable
to find specific differences. They are probably specimens which have developed under more farorable circumstances than are usually accorded to the species.
33. Enneacanthus obesus (Grd.) Gill.
34. Enneacanthus gloriosus* (Holbr.) Jor.
35. Enneacanthus eriarchus (Jor.) McKay,

## 10. Gemus Micropterus Lacépède.

36. Micropterus salmoides (Lac.) Henshall in "Book of the Black Bass" (advance sheets) $=$ Micropterus pallidus Gill \& Jor.
37. Micropterus dolomieu Lacépède $=$ Micropterus salmoides Gill.

Indiana University,
Bloomington, Ind., March 10, 1881.

## A REVEEW OF THE GENUS CENTURES, SWAINSON. By IBORERTETEGUNE.

INTRODUCTION.

The collection of the United States National Musem contains examples of all the known species of the genus Centurus, excepting C. hypopolius (Wagl.), C. rubricentris Swains., and C. terricolor Berlepsch, the two latter being of some what donbtful status. More or less confusion has hitherto existed regarding the nomenclature of several of the Middle American forms, and it was the desire to clear away as much of this confusion as possible that prompted the investigations upon which this review is based, and which have led to the discovery of relationships which were before quite nnsuspected, at least by the writer.

Of the fourteen forms treated of in this paper as sufficiently distinct for definition, not more than six, or less than one-half, can be said to be perfectly isolated, or to possess the requirements of perfectly distinct species; at least the abundant material which has been examined iu this counection proves beyond question the intergradation of four so-called species, while it suggests more or less strongly the probability or possibility of snch relationship with regard to five of the remaining ten. Those which appear to be mequestionably distinct are the three West Indian species, C. radiolatus (Wagl.), C. superciliaris (Temm.), and C. striatus (Mïll.), and three continental species, O. uropygialis, Baird, C. hypopolius (Wagl.), and C. eleggans (Swains.). Those which certainly intergrade, and are therefore to be mited moder one specific designation, are C. aurifrons (WagI.), C. santacruzi Bp., C. dulius (Cabot), aud C. hoff: manni, Caban., all of which are, however, strongly characterized geographical races or sub-species. The five forms of doubtful relationship are (1) C. carolinus (Linn.), which may possibly grade into C. rubriventris, but which is probubly distinct; (2) C. rubricentris (Sw.), with which I


[^0]:    * Oncorhynchus chonicha; O. nerka; Salmo purpuratus; Salrelinus malma. Salmo irideus does not range so far to the northward, and Sulmo gairdncri and the three other species of Oucorhynchus (keta kisutch, gorbuscluu), do not ascend so far from the sea.-D. S. J.

